



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/523,455	03/10/2000	Jurgen Engel	PM 264671	5040

909 7590 05/07/2002

PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

JIANG, SHAOJIA A

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)
	09/523,455	ENGEL ET AL.
	Examiner Shaojia A. Jiang	Art Unit 1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2002.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is a response to Applicant's amendment and response filed on February 28, 2002 in Paper No. 9 wherein claim 2 is cancelled; Claims 1 and 3-24 have been amended. Currently, claims 1 and 3-24 are pending in this application.

An abstract on a separate sheet filed February 28, 2002 in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged.

Applicant's amendment (amending claims 1, 5-12, and 16-19) response filed on February 28, 2002 in Paper No. 9 with respect to the objection to claims 1, 5-12, and 16-19 for minor informalities, i.e., the employment of parenthetical expressions, of record stated in the Office Action dated April 25, 2001 has been fully considered and is found persuasive. Therefore, this said objection is withdrawn.

Applicant's amendment (amending claims 1, 2-4, and 22) response filed on February 28, 2002 in Paper No. 9 with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, and 22 made under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph for the use of the indefinite expressions, of record stated in the Office Action dated April 25, 2001 has been fully considered and is found persuasive to remove the rejection as to claim 1, 2-4, and 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engel et al. (FR, PTO-1449 submitted September 27, 2000) and Albano et al. (PR, PTO-1449 submitted September 27, 2000) and Felberbaum et al. (RR, PTO-1449 submitted September 27, 2000) and Garfield (5,470,847) in view of Deghenghi (5,945,128) and Rabasseda et al. and Kent (4,016,259) essentially for reasons of record stated in the Office Action dated April 25, 2001.

Applicant's remarks filed on February 28, 2002 in Paper No. 9 with respect to this rejection of claims 1-24 made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive as to the nonobviousness of the claimed invention over the prior art for the following reasons.

Applicant's assertion that "the cited combination of art fails to disclose the program and the novel combination of steps that comprises the claimed invention" has been considered but is not found persuasive. It has been held that it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for same purpose in order to form a third composition that is to be used for the very same purpose; idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in prior art. *In re Kerkhoven*, 205 USPQ 1069, CCPA 1980. See MPEP 2144.06. In the instant case, as discussed in the set forth 103(a) rejection in the previous Office Action (April 25, 2001), the instant LHRH-antagonists such as teverelix, antide, and abarelix are known to be LHRH-antagonists and known to be useful in the

methods of controlled ovarian stimulation and assisted reproductive techniques and of the treatment of infertility according to Engel et al., Albano et al., Felberbaum et al., Deghenghi and Rabasseda et al. Thus, each step in the instant claimed method is known in the prior art. Further, the particular estrogen herein, mestranol, in oral contraceptive preparations in combination with progestogen are well known contraceptive agents and also known broadly to be useful in the therapeutic management of infertility according to the prior art. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably expected that combining these particular agents known useful for the same purpose in a composition to be administered would produce additive therapeutic effects to improve the treatment of in the therapeutic management of infertility, absent evidence to the contrary.

Since all active composition components herein are known to useful in the therapeutic management of infertility, it is considered *prima facie* obvious to combine them into a single composition to form a third composition useful for the very same purpose. At least additive therapeutic effects would have been reasonably expected based on the well settled principle set forth *In re Kerkhoven* regarding combination inventions. One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 SPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). See MPEP 2145.

Therefore, motivation to combine the teachings of the prior art cited herein to make the present invention is seen. The claimed invention is clearly obvious in view of the prior art.

Applicant's results of the instant method (program) in the specification at page 4-5 herein have been fully considered with respect to the nonobviousness and/or unexpected results of the claimed invention over the prior art but are not deemed persuasive for the reasons below. The results provide no clear and convincing evidence of nonobviousness or unexpected results over the cited prior art since there is no side-by-side comparison with the closest prior art. Therefore, the evidence presented in specification herein is not seen to support the nonobviousness of the instant claimed invention over the prior art.

For the above stated reasons, said claims are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Therefore, said rejection is adhered to.

In view of the rejections to the pending claims set forth above, no claims are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Jiang, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minna Moezie, J.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4612. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-1235.

Shaojia A. Jiang, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner, AU 1617
April 24, 2002

RUSSELL TRAVERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200